



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/817,634	04/01/2004	Pawin Suthapong	MS1-1936US	2831
22801 7590 01/06/2009				
LEE & HAYES, PLLC 601 W. RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 1400 SPOKANE, WA 99201				
EXAMINER				
SEYE, ABDOU K				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2194				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/06/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/817,634

Applicant(s)

SUTHAPONG, PAWIN

Examiner

Abdou Karim Seye

Art Unit

2194

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 October 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 April 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

. DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-34 are pending in this application.

Claim objection

2. The following terms lack antecedent basis:
 - (i) " the hardware", Claim 15.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-34, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as unpatentable over Chang (US 20040162027) in view of Wittel et al. (US 20030195951), and further in view of Beyda et al. (US 6260160).

5. As to claim 1, Chang teaches the invention substantially as claimed including an a method comprising:

collecting, by a computing device information, about an installed device (100, FIG. 3; paragraph 15, 17, 19-21; 40-41; service attributes) on the computing device ; and

presenting, by the computing device the information on the computing device through a user interface (FIG. 6; 180, FIG. 3; paragraph 16, 22; 46; user interface and a display unit).

6. Chang does not explicitly teach that the installed device is not attached to the computing device, and a special mode for presenting the information.

7. Wittel teaches PnP utility that enable automated plug-in and play of devices not attached to a computer device (FIG. 6, paragraph 54).

8. Beyda teaches a diagnosis procedure for troubleshooting; a special mode for installed devices of a local computer (FIG. 2; col. 7, lines 40-47).

9. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chang, Wittel and Beyda because the PnP utility from Wittel and the special mode from Beyda will improve the efficiency of Chang's system by not only allowing dynamic installation and operation of devices on a client system without rebooting the system, but also by allowing a user to

troubleshoot installed device on a client system in order to improve performance of the peripheral devices.

10. As to claims 15 and 29, they are rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 above.

11. As to claim 2, Chang teaches, wherein the information presented comprises all data available to an operating system running on the computing device regarding the installed device (Fig. 3; paragraph 33).

12. As to claim 3, Beyda teaches, wherein the special mode is a troubleshooting mode (abstract).

13. As to claim 4, Wittel teaches, modifying information regarding the installed device in response to a modification request (812; FIG. 8B; where the claimed element "a user request to update the driver" of wittel's reference meets the claimed limitation of the claim)

14. As to claim 5, Wittel teaches, modifying information regarding the installed device in response to a modification request, wherein the modification request is one or

more items selected from a group comprising change value and delete value (paragraph 54).

As to claim 6, it are rejected for the same reasons as claims 4 above.

15. As to claim 7, chang teaches, wherein the information is presented in response to a user selecting the installed device (abstract; paragraph 40).

16. As to claim 8, Wittel teaches, wherein the information is dynamically updated in response to a change event (902,FIG. 9 ; paragraph 61).

17. As to claim 9, Wittel teaches, wherein the information is dynamically updated in response to a hot-plugging event (paragraph 49 and 51).

18. As to claim 10, Wittel teaches wherein the information regarding the installed device is one or more items selected from a group comprising device hardware ID, device status, device ID, device port type, device driver version, device driver provider, device driver INF location, device driver section, device drivers' file list, device drivers services' status, and device drivers' service information (paragraph 60).

19. As to claim 11, chang teaches, wherein the information is presented to a local user (abstract).

20. As to claim 12, Beyda teaches, wherein the information regarding the installed device is provided to a remote support person (col. 7, lines 40-53).

21. As to claim 13, Wittel teaches, wherein the information regarding the installed device is provided to a remote support person through one or more communication channels selected from a group comprising a public telephone network, Internet, and an intranet(FIG. 2; paragraph 45).

22. As to claim 14, Wittel teaches, wherein the method indicates whether a driver installation is incomplete (paragraph 60).

23. As to claims 16-28 and 30-34, they are rejected for the same reasons as the claims above.

Response to Arguments

24. Applicant's arguments filed on October 21, 2008 with respect to claims 1-34 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

25. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Abdou Karim Seye whose telephone number is 571-270-1062. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:30 - 6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, An Meng can be reached on (571)272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Li B. Zhen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2194

/Abdou Karim Seye/
Examiner, Art Unit 2194